DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 585 CE 044 521

TITLE Employment Initiatives. Third Year Report.
INSTITUTION Maryland State Dept. of Human Resources, Baltimore.
PUB DATE Dec 85
NOTE 32p.; For related documents, see CE 044 519-522.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Programs; Adults; Demonstration Programs; *Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Job Search Methods; *Job Training; One Parent Family; Remedial Instruction; *State Programs; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS *Employment Initiatives; Maryland

ABSTRACT

The third operational year of the Employment Initiatives (EI) saw expansion throughout Maryland with the addition of new projects in Anne Arundel, Allegany, Dorchester, Frederick, and Harford counties during October 1984. In July 1985, other projects were funded in Baltimore City, Southern Maryland, and Montgomery County. EI offered a package of program activities leading to unsubsidized employment, including skills and remedial training, training in job search techniques, supportive services, and financial incentives. Clients included Work Incentive Demonstration Program clients and Aid for Dependent Children recipients. An evaluation of the original two EI projects, OPTIONS in Baltimore City and Basic Employment Training (BET) in Wicomico County, concluded that programs designed to increase employment among welfare recipients make a difference and can be cost-effective. Through its three years of operations, EI demonstrated that resources can be coordinated successfully at the local level to provide the employment, training, and support services public assistance recipients need to make the transition to private sector employment; the heterogeneous population of welfare recipients has diverse employment, training, and service needs; and the most disadvantaged gain the most from this type of program. (Appendixes include EI project descriptions, selected baseline characteristics, and client activity data.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Employment Initiatives

Third Year Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MD Dept of Human Resources
D Siegel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Maryland Department of Human Resources
Office of Business Employment Policy
December 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
° Introduction	1
° Program Overview	2
Baltimore City and Wicomico County Employment Initiatives	
Expanded Employment Initiatives	
° Client Characteristics	3
Baltimore City and Wicomico County	
Expanded Employment Initiatives	
° Summary of Third Year Activity	4
Baltimore City	
Wicomico County	
Grant Diversion Funded On-the-Job Training	
Job Retention Rates	
Expanded Employment Initiatives Projects	
° Evaluation	9
MDRC Evaluation	
Expanded Employment Initiatives - Observations	
° Lessons Learned from the Employment Initiatives	11
° Appendices	
Employment Initiatives Projects Descriptions	A
Selected Baseline Characteristics	B
Selected Baseline Characteristics of Expanded Employment Initiatives	C
Employment Initiatives Client Activity	D
OPTIONS Grant Diversion	E
BET Grant Diversion	F
Expanded Employment Initiatives Client Activities	G

INTRODUCTION

The paramount goal of the Maryland Department of Human Resources is to assist as many clients as are able into self-support. Further, the Department maintains that self-sufficiency through private sector employment is the only permanent solution to long-term poverty and welfare dependency. The focal point for the Department's self-sufficiency activities is the DHR Office of Welfare Employment Policy (OWEP) established in July, 1984. OWEP administers the Department's Employment Initiatives program, oversees the State's Work Incentive (WIN) Demonstration Program and works at the state and local levels to promote greater participation by DHR clients in employment, training, and economic development activities.

The OWEP goal, manifest in the Employment Initiatives, is the creation and funding of innovative projects designed to enable welfare recipients make the transition to economic self-sufficiency through private sector employment. The Employment Initiatives projects are closely monitored by OWEP not only to assure smooth operation but to analyze those factors that are most effective in assisting DHR clients to move toward economic self-sufficiency. The original Employment Initiatives projects commenced operation during October 1982 in portions of Baltimore City and Wicomico County. These two projects are being evaluated by the nationally recognized Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) as part of their national study of innovative state designed welfare to work programs.

The third operational year of the Employment Initiatives saw considerable expansion of Departmental welfare to work activity throughout the state with the addition of new projects in Anne Arundel, Allegany, Dorchester, Frederick and Harford Counties during October 1984. In July 1985, other projects were funded in Baltimore City, Southern Maryland and Montgomery County.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Employment Initiatives offers a package of program activities leading to unsubsidized employment. These activities include skills and remedial training, training in job search techniques, supportive services such as day care and transportation as well as financial incentives to both clients and employers. Unique features of the Employment Initiatives Program include:

-- utilizing WIN Demonstration funds to leverage other state, county and city resources to obtain employment and training services for welfare recipients. In particular, linkages have been established with the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Private Industry Councils, local education agencies, community colleges and the private sector in order to ensure delivery of services to clients;

-- utilizing waivers of federal law to obtain additional resources for Job Search Assistance;

-- subsidizing private sector employment through diversion of a portion of the welfare grant into an on-the-job training (OJT) experience, thereby increasing the resources available to assist clients;

-- avoiding unnecessary and complicated program designs, keeping contractual arrangements with employers as simple and straightforward as possible; and finally;

-- focusing resources on the entire eligible client population, not just those viewed as having the greatest employment potential.

The Baltimore City and Wicomico County Employment Initiatives

The Baltimore City project, called OPTIONS, serves AFDC recipients from four local DSS offices required by law to register for the WIN program as well as those who volunteer to participate. The Wicomico County project, called Basic Employment Training (BET), serves the County's entire WIN caseload. Although both projects have similar program components, participation in these components differs because of program structure. All BET participants are required to participate in job search assistance classes as their first activity. Should they fail to find jobs, they then receive service from the other employment and training components. This is not the case in Baltimore City, where OPTIONS clients are placed in job search assistance classes or other activities based on an assessment of their need for a particular type of training or employment at any given time during their tenure in the program.

The Expanded Employment Initiatives

In the fall of 1984 five new Employment Initiatives projects were funded, each one serving a specific target client population. The five projects tested locally developed and implemented models of welfare to work programs. In general, the projects included coordination of resources and services with local government and manpower agencies as well as education and health agencies as appropriate. (A brief summary of each project appears in Appendix A.) Project sponsors included the Departments of Social Services in Allegany, Anne Arundel, Dorchester and Frederick Counties and Harford County OPEN DOORS, a private non-profit organization serving displaced homemakers.

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS

Baltimore City (OPTIONS) and Wicomico County (BET)

Initially only WIN mandatory clients were served by OPTIONS in Baltimore City while BET served the entire WIN caseload in Wicomico County. Available data from the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, (MDRC) collected during client intake indicate some significant differences between OPTIONS and BET clients. (See Appendix B) The MDRC sample represents clients entering the program from October 1982 through the end of 1983.

Over 80 percent of the OPTIONS sample were women and over 63 percent were black. Almost half the sample had been on welfare for over two years prior to participation in OPTIONS while only 18 percent were new to the AFDC rolls. More than half the sample had worked in the two years prior to OPTIONS participation.

In Wicomico County, by contrast, 36 percent of the BET participants were men and 46 percent were white. Over 30 percent had never received AFDC previously and over 75 percent had been employed in the two years before program participation. Overall, BET enrollees were more likely than OPTIONS enrollees to be white and male as well as to have worked more recently and to be less welfare dependent.

Expanded Employment Initiatives

Client characteristics of the new Employment Initiatives appear in Appendix C. These characteristics reflect the different subgroups which were the programs' different target populations. All clients in these projects are volunteers.

Allegany County planned to serve AFDC-UP recipients; consequently, the Allegany County Employment Initiative has the highest proportion of male clients of any project. Allegany County clients are mostly white,

married and living with a spouse. They also are the most likely to be high school graduates. Interestingly, Allegany County clients were the least dependent on AFDC, as measured by prior welfare recipients, and were also the least likely to have held a job at any time during the past two years.

The target population for the Anne Arundel County project was AFDC recipients with earnings or a recent work history. Clients were largely female and over 66% were black. Less than half the clients were on AFDC for over two years and over 50 percent had held a job during the part two years.

The Dorchester County Employment Initiative planned to serve AFDC teenage mothers between the ages of 16 and 21. Consequently, its clients were the youngest, 19 years on average, with the lowest percent of high school graduates. In addition over 93 percent were black, over 45 percent had held a job during the past two years and slightly more than 20 percent had been on welfare for more than two years.

Frederick County originally planned to serve AFDC-UP cases and single parents with only one child who had received assistance for less than twelve months. Consequently, less than 6 percent of its clients had received welfare for more than 2 years and almost 52% had held a job during the past two years. Its clients were almost all female, over 60 percent were white with an average 11th grade education.

Harford County had a broader AFDC target population at the outset. Its clients were the oldest, averaging over 30 years, and next to Allegany had the highest percent of high school graduates. In addition, Harford County participants were over 62 percent white and almost all female. Finally, almost 45 percent had been on AFDC for more than 2 years while 44 percent had held a job during the past two years.

SUMMARY OF THIRD YEAR CLIENTS ACTIVITY

OPTIONS (Baltimore City)

During FY 1985, 1080 WIN clients were registered into OPTIONS. Of those registered, 551 or 51% actively participated. (Appendix D) The following chart shows the activities in which OPTIONS clients participated.

	OPTIONS Participants*	Percent of Active Participants (551)
Work Experience	185	34
Pre Employment Training	169	31
Job Search Assistance	185	70
Remedial Education	99	18
Grant Diversion/OJT	89	16
Skills Training	36	7

*The sum of this column is greater than the number of active participants since clients frequently participate in more than one activity.

During FY 1985, 457 OPTIONS clients entered employment producing an active participant placement rate of 83%. The average placement wage was $4.10 per hour; $4.05 per hour for the 397 OPTIONS women placed and $4.44 per hour for the 60 OPTIONS men placed.

BET (Wicomico County)

During the third operational year there were 353 clients registered in BET. Of these 353 clients, 248 or 70 percent actively participated in a component activity. By the end of September 1985, active BET clients had participated in the following activities.

	Number of Participants	Percent of Active Participants (248)
Job Search Assistance and Pre Employment Training	193	78
Work Experience	47	19
Remedial Education	56	23
OJT	45	18
Skills Training	63	25

There were 180 BET clients who entered employment during 1985 producing a 73% active participant placement rate. Of these 180 placements, 121 participated in the three week BET job search assistance and pre-employment training class. The average wage for placements to BET class graduates was $3.82 per hour. The average wage for women was $3.70 per hour and for men $4.65 per hour.

Grant Diversion Funded On the Job Training

OPTIONS OJT

During its third operational year 89 OPTIONS clients were placed in OJT positions. This is almost twice the number placed in 1984. (The list of placements appears in Appendix E.) The average training wage was almost $4.00 per hour; $4.86 per hour for men and $3.89 per hour for women. The average unsubsidized placement wage was $4.21 per hour.

NOTE: The concept of prevailing wage in a geographic area is significant. Wage rates differ between the Employment Initiative sites. For example, the Department of Economic and Community Development publication Opportunities for Technology Based Manufacturing in Maryland the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) indicated that prevailing wages for certain jobs on the Eastern Shore "are among the lowest in the country."

BET OJT

A total of 45 BET clients were placed in Grant Diversion funded OJT positions during FFY 1985: 9 males and 36 females. The average training wage was $3.97 per hour: $4.15 per hour for men and $3.92 per hour for women. (See Appendix F for a list of placements.)

Job Retention Rates for OPTIONS and BET

Since the primary goal of the Employment Initiatives is the transition of welfare recipients into permanent unsubsidized employment, job retention rates are crucial to program success. Consequently, OWEP staff conducted a small study to determine job retention rates for OPTIONS (Baltimore City) and BET (Wicomico County) job placements.

During November 1984 an attempt was made to contact all BET and OPTIONS clients who found employment during February and May 1984. The results of this survey allowed OWEP to calculate six and nine month job retention rates. Since the OPTIONS survey was more detailed than the BET survey, there is more detailed information available for OPTIONS than for BET.

BET

Over 50 BET clients were placed in jobs during February and May 1984. The average starting wage for these placements was $3.98 per hour. The placements were 80 percent female and 20 percent male. BET staff were able to obtain information on 40 of these clients for the employment follow up. The results show that six months after job placement, over half the sample were employed, with one third employed at the original placement. After nine months, 47 percent were employed with 18 percent in the original BET job placement.

OPTIONS

A sample of 70 OPTIONS clients was identified for employment follow up: 37 people were placed in employment during May 1984 and 33 were placed during February. For a period of three weeks in November 1984 repeated attempts were made to contact and interview clients. At the end of this period, 50 interviews had been completed.

Sample Characteristics - The sample was 80 percent female and 78 percent black. The average age of the OPTIONS respondent was 31.6 years and she had 11.3 years of education. The average family size was 3.6.

Employment Characteristics - At the time of the interview, 64 percent of the respondents were working, 52 percent in the job they had been placed in by OPTIONS. Twenty four percent of the clients were looking for employment, six percent were unemployed and not looking for work while six percent were in school.

Job Characteristics - The average starting wage for the OPTIONS placements was $4.25 and the average wage at the time of the interview was $4.43. Thirty six percent of the respondents were placed in service occupations, 30 percent in clerical and administrative positions, 12 percent in production work, 10 percent were laborers, 8 percent were placed in marketing and sales, and 4 percent in health positions.

Retention Rates - After three months, 70 percent of the OPTIONS respondents were still working in the original OPTIONS placement. After 6 months 62 percent were working in the OPTIONS placement and 74 percent were employed in any job. After 9 months, 48 percent continued in the OPTIONS placement and 52 percent were employed in any job.

THE EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES PROJECTS

Combined, the five new projects enrolled 631 clients during their first full year of operation. Of the 631 clients enrolled, 463 or 73 percent actively participated in a component activity. (See Appendix G) This very high level of client participation reflects the fact that 3 of the projects, "Roots and Wings" (Dorchester), "I-Step" (Frederick), and "REACH" (Harford) are service oriented projects in which active participation approaches 100%. The other two projects, the Allegany County Employment Initiative and "JOBS" (Anne Arundel) were more manpower oriented emphasizing in the former case, skills training and in the latter case, job search and skills training.

Depending on the program model and the target population, the projects emphasized different component activities. Thus, although all the projects had skills training activities, Allegany with its emphasis on the AFDC-UP population was largely a skills training program. Consequently, most of its client activity was in skills training and all active participants participated in skills training. Since most participants in Allegany and Anne Arundel Counties were assumed to have past experience, few were involved in pre-employment training. In contrast, 97% of the REACH active participants, 53% of the I-STEP active participants and 49% of the ROOTS and WINGS active participants participated in pre-employment training.

For all five new projects combined, the active participant placement rate was 47%. The average starting wage ranged from $3.88 per hour in Dorchester County to $4.75 per hour in Allegany County. The variation

reflects not only local labor market variation but the fact that target client groups have tremendous differences in age, education, and past employment experience.

EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES

	Average Placement Wage
Alleçany	$4.75
Anne Arundel	4.36
Dorchester	3.88
Frederick	4.13
Harford	3.96

PROGRAM EVALUATION

MDRC Evaluation

The original two Employment Initiatives, OPTIONS and BET, were evaluated by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), under a contract from the Department of Human Resources. Maryland is one of eleven states being evaluated by MDRC as part of a large-scale multi-year evaluation of different employment programs for welfare recipients that states have developed under the authority of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. The Interim Maryland Evaluation report, largely a process analysis, was released in February 1984, and the final report will be published early in 1986. The final report focuses on the impacts of OPTIONS on participants' employment and welfare receipt, and the programs relative benefits and costs.

The impact and benefit-cost analyses compare outcomes for individuals randomly assigned either to the OPTIONS Program or to a program of regular WIN services. The WIN program stressed direct placement of its participants into the labor force while OPTIONS stressed long term employability development. In recognition of the fact that welfare recipients frequently have educational deficits and lack job skills, OPTIONS emphasized work experience, basic literacy and GED preparation, as well as skills training, and on the job training.

The MDRC evaluation emphasizes, at the outset, that the analysis of OPTIONS' program impacts is conservative for two reasons. First, OPTIONS' participants are not being compared to individuals who received no services, but rather, to those who received some regular WIN services. Second, it is not clear that a follow-up period of five quarters after random assignment is sufficient to capture all the positive effects of a program that emphasizes up-front human capital development. However, even with these constraints the OPTIONS program had a positive net effect on program participants.

Findings on Implementation and Participation

- OPTIONS was successful in making a wide variety of employability services available to program enrollees indicating that a manpower agency can respond to the services needs of welfare recipients.

- Participation rates in OPTIONS and BET were similar. Overall, 52 percent of BET enrollees participated in a program activity within 12 months after program entry compared to 53 percent of the OPTIONS enrollees.

- The populations served by OPTIONS and BET were notably disadvantaged with respect to education and prior welfare receipt. OPTIONS staff made an effort to serve all enrollees, including those with little prior employment experience and largely accomplished its objective of targeting services to registrants' disparate needs.

- In both OPTIONS and BET the participation levels in education and training were higher than in other employment programs studied by MDRC.

Findings on Program Impact

- The OPTIONS program achieved short-term increases in employment and earnings for participants.
- Earnings impacts appeared to continue and even increase after the short term observation period.
- The impacts of the OPTIONS program on employment and earnings were stronger for sample members who lack recent work experience.

Findings from the Benefit Cost Analysis

- The social net present value of serving OPTIONS clients was positive.
- The program's positive effects on employment led to most of the major program benefits - increased earnings and taxes and reduced AFDC and Food Stamp costs. The value of the WIN work experience is also important.

Conclusions

The MDRC evaluation concludes that programs designed to increase employment among welfare recipients can and do make a difference, and that they can be cost-effective as well. In the case of OPTIONS, the magnitude of the difference and impacts were measured directly only for a limited period: one adequate to capture the impacts of a program focusing on job search -- but inadequate to record the effects of longer-term service components. Longer-term service components, such as skills training and remedial education, are principal offerings of the Baltimore program to its less employable enrollees. Thus, it is expected that the full magnitude of participation in the OPTIONS program will show up in the supplemental analysis to be conducted on the full sample followed over a longer period of time.

Expanded Employment Initiatives Projects - Observations

From a process standpoint, the expanded projects serve as solid examples of how local Departments of Social Services (DSS) can organize themselves to provide case management and client self-sufficiency services to AFDC clients. The projects also demonstrate that the necessary training, pre-employment training and education services can be secured for AFDC clients by the local DSS from available local agencies. These

projects serve as models for local/state interagency cooperation, on both a formal and informal basis. Systems were developed to link welfare clients to necessary self-support resources.

From a client perspective, the expanded projects provided information about available services so that they could utilize employment and training services they might otherwise not even know exist. Clients also obtain the necessary accessibility to such services, as the projects were able to provide the necessary prerequisites and support services to reduce the barriers to participating in the projects. Furthermore, clients were provided the opportunity to change their own attitudes regarding their own employability and self-sufficiency.

From a social services perspective, the projects increased the awareness of meployment and training services in the country. The projects also increased the interaction between social services workers and other local agencies. The social services agencies were motivated to link with the principal providers of employment and training services in the area in a highly productive manner. Furthermore, the initial planning goals of the various projects were generally met.

LESSONS FROM THE EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES

After three years of operation, the Employment Initiatives has demonstrated that resources can be coordinated successfully at the local level to provide the employment, training and support services required to enable recipients of public assistance make the transition to private sector employment. Furthermore, the Employment Initiatives has substantiated the notion that a population as heterogeneous as recipients of public assistance has diverse employment, training and service needs. Thus, no one activity alone can assist AFDC recipients to move into the labor market. The transition to private sector employment for AFDC recipients necessitates an available and comprehensive package of services including work experience, job search assistance, vocational training, remedial education and on-the-job training, along with a full array of support services.

The Employment Initiatives also has demonstrated the value of serving the most disadvantaged, in terms of previous work experience or least employable welfare recipients. While many AFDC recipients require limited services to enable them to become self-sufficient, there are some, the most disadvantaged, who require the full array of services. What has been learned is that it is this latter group that gains the most from a program like the Employment Initiatives. Although a job ready AFDC recipient's search for a job may be facilitated with job search assistance, a long term welfare recipient may never find a job in the absence of a

program providing a range of services including essential and time consuming remedial education and skills training components. While disadvantaged clients may be costly to serve, they are precisely the clients whose success results in major welfare savings. They will remain dependent on public assistance in the absence of programs such as the Employment Initiatives, while more job ready clients may leave public assistance after a short period through their own efforts.

Finally, the Employment Initiatives has demonstrated that program success depends upon local labor market conditions. Since an excellent employment and training program will have limited success in a depressed economy where jobs are limited, continued success for the Employment Initiatives depends upon efforts to link employment and training programs for welfare recipients with economic development in depressed areas of Maryland.

EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES PROJECTS

The first group of expanded Employment Initiatives projects began on October 1, 1984. Project operators were asked to develop projects which targeted a particular group of AFDC recipients in their local area who could benefit from employment and training services designed to address their special needs.

JURISDICTION:	Allegany County
AGENCY:	Allegany County Department of Social Services
TARGET POPULATION:	AFDC-UP Recipients
NUMBER SERVED:	200
GOAL:	Successful completion of training for 180 recipients with 72 placements.
PROGRAM MODEL:	To provide AFDC-UP recipients access to existing services. Each recipient of AFDC-UP in Allegany County was contacted to discuss training available at Allegany Community College. Funds were used to purchase training, counseling and job search services. Two displaced workers were hired as case managers.

JURISDICTION:	Anne Arundel County
AGENCY:	Anne Arundel County DSS
TARGET POPULATION:	Volunteer AFDC recipients with earnings or a recent work history.
NUMBER SERVED:	100
GOAL:	55 Job Placements
PROGRAM MODEL:	Job Search Training for 50 WIN eligible AFDC recipients with previous work experience. Adult work skills training for 20 WIN eligible AFDC recipients with minimal work experience. Training in basic office skills for 30 WIN eligible AFDC recipients.

JURISDICTION:	Dorchester County
AGENCY:	Dorchester County Department of Social Services
TARGET POPULATION:	AFDC teenage mothers between ages of 16 and 21.
NUMBER SERVED:	40
GOAL:	16 obtain unsubsidized employment, 9 obtain GED or skills training, 5 go on to higher education and 10 continue in school.
PROGRAM MODEL:	Provide education and training through existing educational facilities in the Dorchester County School system, along with ancillary services such as day care, parenting training, home management assistance and transportation.

JURISDICTION:	Frederick County
AGENCY:	Frederick County Department of Social Services
TARGET POPULATION:	Head of household in two parent AFDC cases and single parents with only one child who have received AFDC for less than twelve months.
NUMBER SERVED:	45 AFDC Households
GOAL:	27 Heads of household placed in unsubsidized employment (60%).
PROGRAM MODEL:	Provide increased outreach, screening, support and training services to AFDC recipients through use of existing Job Training Agency (JTA) services. DSS case managers inform the target population of the program, screen clients, arrange for supportive services and refer clients to JTA. There will be a joint intake during which the supportive services and training/employment needs of each participant will be identified. In addition, a three way Individual Service and Employment Plan (I STEP) will be established. There will be 4 JTA Modules for participation, Job Readiness, Pre-Training, Training and Job Search Assistance.

JURISDICTION:	Harford County
AGENCY:	Harford County OPEN DOORS
TARGET POPULATION:	AFDC Recipients
NUMBER SERVED:	300
GOAL:	150 placed in training and/or employment
PROGRAM MODEL:	Individualized approach based on the displaced homemaker model, providing ongoing support, human development seminars, career development, job search training and skills training. Clients are screened at DSS. Upon referral to OPEN DOORS intake, assessment and pre-employment training takes place. Necessary support services are provided. Counselor and peer support continue through weekly group meeting and individual counseling. As clients are deemed job ready, specific referral to existing openings are made.

EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES PROJECTS

The second group of Employment Initiatives projects began on July 1, 1985. Project operators were asked to develop projects which specifically address the employment and training needs of teen parents (ages 16 to 19) or young adults (ages 16 to 24) in their local area.

JURISDICTION:	Baltimore City
AGENCY:	Urban Services Agency
TARGET POPULATION:	AFDC teen parents between the ages of 16 and 19 who are not presently mandated to participate in WIN.
NUMBER SERVED:	100
GOAL:	To increase the employability and educational level of target population.
PROGRAM MODEL:	Assist AFDC recipients acquire full time permanent positions. Various public and private agencies will provide vocational, educational and support services.

JURISDICTION:	Charles, Calvert and St. Mary's Counties
AGENCY:	Charles County Department of Social Services
TARGET POPULATION:	Teen parents or young adults ages 16-21 applicants or recipients of AFDC.
NUMBER SERVED:	96
GOAL:	55% (53) entered employment
PROGRAM MODEL:	Provide educational, vocational and support services through the cooperative efforts of various public and community agencies

JURISDICTION:	Montgomery County
AGENCY:	Montgomery County Government
TARGET POPULATION:	AFDC teen parents (age 16-19) and AFDC recipients (age 20-24) who have been on the rolls at least 2 years.
NUMBER SERVED:	100
GOAL:	50% obtain full-time unsubsidized employment within a year; GED completion or completion of other training related activities by 25% of the participants.
PROGRAM MODEL:	Educational and skills training are provided by using existing local educational facilities. Support services will be provided by the Department of Social Services.

JURISDICTION:	Harford County
AGENCY:	Harford County OPEN DOORS
TARGET POPULATION:	Teen parents ages 16-19 and young adults ages 20-24 who are AFDC applicants or recipients.
NUMBER SERVED:	60 teen parents and 72 young adults
GOAL:	50% (36) of young adults to enter employment 25% (15) of teen parents placed in employment.
PROGRAM MODEL:	Individualized approach providing ongoing support services, vocational and educational training, and job search training through various local agencies.

JURISDICTION:	Frederick County
AGENCY:	Frederick County Department of Social Services
TARGET POPULATION:	Young adults ages 20-24, AFDC applicants or recipients.
NUMBER SERVED:	45
GOAL:	60% to obtain employment (27)
PROGRAM MODEL:	Department of Social Services case managers will refer clients to existing Job Training Agency (JTA) services. JTA will provide outreach, screening, support and training services.

From Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

SELECTED BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS
OF EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES CLIENTS

Characteristic	Baltimore OPTIONS	Wicomico BET
Age (%):		
Less Than 25 Years	14.6	19.1
25 to 34 Years	52.7	50.1
35 to 44 Years	24.2	22.8
45 to 69 Years	8.5	7.3
Average Age (Years)	31.7	30.7
Sex (%):		
Male	19.0	36.1
Female	81.0	63.9
Assistance Category (%):		
AFDC	89	75.4
AFDC-UP	11	24.6
Welfare Status (%):		
Applicant	52.7	60.8
Recipient	47.3	39.2
Ethnicity (%):		
White, Non-Hispanic	35.3	46.0
Black, Non-Hispanic	63.2	53.2
Hispanic	.4	0.4
Other	1.1	0.4
Degree Received (%):		
None	58.5	58.6
GED	6.8	9.5
High School Diploma	34.7	31.9
Average Highest Grade Completed	10.4	10.3
Currently in School (%)	13.5	2.0
Marital Status (%):		
Never Married	35.4	27.9
Married, Living With Spouse	17.9	27.3
Married, Not Living With Spouse	30.3	25.0
Divorced, Widowed	16.4	19.7

Characteristic	Baltimore OPTIONS	Wicomico BET
Average Number of Children by Age:		
Less Than Four Years	0.23	0.30
Four to Five Years	0.10	0.10
Six to Twelve Years	1.0	0.97
Thirteen to Eighteen Years	0.55	0.50
Average Number of Children Under 19 Years	1.89	1.87
Prior AFDC Dependency (%):		
Never on AFDC	18.0	31.1
Two Years or Less	32.5	31.9
More Than Two Years	49.5	37.0
Average Months on AFDC During Two Year Pre-Application Period	12.7	8.9
Held a Job at Any Time in the Two Years Prior to Application	52.1	76.1
Total Sample	1568	524

SOURCE: MDRC Client Information Sheet

NOTES: Distributions may not add up to exactly 100.0 percent because of rounding.

SELECTED BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES CLIENTS

Characteristic	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Dorchester	Frederick	Harford
Age (%):					
16-19 Years	1.0	3.3	51.8	16.7	3.6
20-24 Years	27.3	19.2	48.2	49.0	23.2
25-34 Years	53.7	58.2	0.0	26.0	44.6
35-44 Years	13.2	16.4	0.0	6.9	23.2
45-59 Years	4.9	2.8	0.0	0.9	5.4
Average Age (Years)	29.4	29.9	19.3	22.3	30.5
Sex (%):					
Male	55	2.75	----	4.8	1.7
Female	45	97.25	100	95.2	98.3
Welfare Status (%):					
Applicant	----	17.6	4.4	0	4
Recipient	100	82.4	95.6	100	96
Ethnicity (%):					
White	97.5	30.8	6.8	61.5	62.1
Black	2.5	66.5	93.2	38.5	37.9
Other	----	2.7	----	----	----
Average Highest Grade Comp.	11.3	10.6	10.8	11.03	11.3
Degree Received (%)					
None	24.3	41.3	49.1	47.1	33.3
GED	16.0	12.8	9.1	5.9	12.3
High School Diploma	59.7	45.9	41.8	47.1	54.4

Characteristic	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Dorchester	Frederick	Harford
Marital Status					
Never Married	2.0	52.5	96.6	61.5	28.8
Married Living With Spouse	88.2	7.2	1.7	9.6	11.9
Married, Not Livng With Spouse	5.4	21.6	1.7	14.4	33.9
Divorced, Widowed	4.4	18.8	----	14.4	25.4
Average Number of Children By Age					
Less than 4 Years	.9	.5	1.09	.7	.43
4-5 Years	.33	.21	.16	.15	.2
6-12 Years	.62	.46	.04	.18	.79
13-18 Years	.22	.4	0	.05	.46
Prior AFDC Dependency (%)					
Never on AFDC	66%	15.3	28.1	1.0	6.9
Two Years or Less	27.7%	35.8	50.9	93.1	48.3
More Than Two Years	6.3%	48.9	21.1	5.9	44.8
Held Job At Any Time During Past 2 Years (%)	30.6	52.2	45	51.9	44.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1985
Employment Initiatives
Client Activity
(Projects Started Fall, 1982)

	BALTO. CITY OPTIONS	WICOMICO BET	TOTAL
SUMMARY			
1. Total Registered	1080	353	1433
a. WIN Mandatory	969	329	1298
b. WIN Voluntary	111	24	135
2. Entered employment	457	180	637
3. Sanctioned	61	50	111
4. Deregistered	493	344	837
5. Total Active Participants	551	248	799
6. Total Placement Rate Item 2 ÷ Item 1	42%	51%	44%
7. Active Participant Placement Rate Item 2 ÷ Item 5	83%	73%	80%
COMPONENT ACTIVITY			
1. Entered pre-employment training (PET)	169	NA	169
2. Entered Job Search Assistance	385	21	406
3. Entered combined JSA/PET	NA	172	172
4. Entered Work Experience	185	47	232
5. Entered Grant Diversion/OJT	89	45	134
6. Entered Skills Training	36	63	99
7. Entered Remedial Education	99	56	155

OPTIONS Grant Diversion/OJT Placements
Training Wages

JOBS	WAGE	MALE	FEMALE
General Factory Worker Trainee	$3.50	1	50
Teller Trainee	4.00		3
Office Assistant	5.00		1
Sewing Machine Operator Trainee	4.25		3
Router Operator Trainee	4.25	1	2
Senior File Clerk Trainee	5.00		1
Office Helper Trainee	4.00		1
Nurse's Aide	3.35		1
Construction Aide	3.50		1
Dental Assistant Trainee	4.00		1
Protective Officer Trainee	6.13	4	4
Warehouse	4.25	3	
Crew Leader	4.25		2
Billing Clerk	4.00		1
Carburetor Repair	4.25	1	
Bookeeper Trainee	5.50		1
Industrial Sewing Machine Operator	4.50		1
Manager Trainee	5.80		1
Spring Mechanic Trainee	4.25	1	
Cashier	4.00		1
Operator I	4.25		1
Stripper Machine Operator	4.50		1
Administrative Assistant	5.00		1
		N = 11	N = 78

Average training wage 3.99

Average training wage for men 4.86

Average training wage for women 3.89

BET GRANT DIVERSION/OJT PLACEMENTS

Training Wages

JOBS	WAGE	MALE	FEMALE
Short Order Cook	$3.75		1
Food Service Worker	3.35		2
Maintenance Supervisor	4.00	2	
Nurse's Aide	3.35		1
Cashier/Checker	3.60		4
	4.00		1
	3.75		2
Carpenter Apprentice	4.50	2	
	4.00	1	
Counter Supervisor	3.50		1
Secretary	4.00		1
	3.50		1
	4.50		1
Cook's Helper	3.35	1	1
Teacher's Aide	3.45		1
	4.50		1
Shipping Clerk	3.45		2
Laborer Stores	4.25	1	
Laundry Worker	3.35		2
Machinist	4.77	1	
Day Care Aide	3.50		1
Sales Clerk	4.00		1
General Clerk	5.00		1
Operating Engineer Apprentice	4.64		1
Meter Attendant	5.28		1
Commercial Cleaner	4.00		3
Electronic Assembler	4.00		2
Pile Drive	4.00	1	
Dispatcher	5.38		1
Production Supervisor	5.18		1
		N = 9	N = 36

Average Wage $3.97

Average wage for men $4.15

Average wage for women $3.92

1985
Employment Initiatives
Client Activity
(Projects Started Fall, 1984)

	HARFORD REACH	ANNE ARUNDEL JOBS	DORCHESTER ROOTS & WINGS	ALLEGANY	FREDERICK I-STEP	TOTAL
SUMMARY						
1. Total Registered*	77	172	56	213	113	631
2. Entered employment	24	79	29	44	40	216
3. Deregistered	20	43	36	6	90	195
4. Total Active Participants	73	118	55	104	113	463
5. Total Placement Rate Item 2÷ Item 1	31%	46%	52%	21%	35%	34%
6. Active Participant Placement Rate Item 2÷ Item 5	33%	67%	53%	42%	35%	47%
COMPONENT ACTIVITY						
1. Entered Pre-Employment Training	71	19	27	7	60	184
2. Entered Job Search Assistance	30	32	33	26	24	145
3. Entered Work Experience	5	41	42	8	19	115
4. Entered Grant Diversion/OJT	1	0	0	0	6	7
5. Entered Skills Training	54	45	36	110	50	295
6. Entered Remedial Education	10	9	19	11	20	69

* All participants are voluntary

APPENDIX G